



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BULLETIN
OF THE
TORREY BOTANICAL CLUB

JUNE, 1914

Notes on Rosaceae—VII*

PER AXEL RYDBERG

ALCHEMILLA

In the North American Flora this genus is taken in a narrow sense, *i. e.*, as Linnaeus originally understood it. The genus *Aphanes* L., which was merged in *Alchemilla* by Scopoli, differs not only in the habit, being leafy-stemmed annuals, instead of scapose perennials with rootstocks, but the stamens are usually solitary, rarely more numerous, and opposite to one or more of the sepals, instead of being 4 and alternate with the sepals. The disk in the throat of the hypanthium, so characteristic of the typical *Alchemillas*, is almost obsolete in *Aphanes*.

The so-called *Alchemillas* of America are perennials, some of them in habit not so unlike the Old World species; but in all the stamens are only 2 and inserted on the inside of the disk instead of the outside, and the anthers extrorse instead of introrse. For these the subgeneric name *Lachemilla* of Focke was adopted, except for one species of exceptional habit, which was made into a distinct genus *Zygalechemilla*.

All the species of true *Alchemilla* have their home in Europe. Only five of them are either adventive or naturalized on this side of the Atlantic and all are confined to the northeastern corner of North America.

Alchemilla alpina L. ranges in America from Greenland to the island of Miquelon and the White Mountains of New Hampshire.

* These notes, continued from Bull. Torrey Club 38: 367 (1911), are supplementary to the monograph in volume 22 of the North American Flora.

[The BULLETIN for May (41: 265-318. *pl.* 7) was issued 29 My 1914.]

Alchemilla pratensis F. W. Smith and the three succeeding species are segregated from *A. vulgaris* L. *A. pratensis* has usually been known here under the name *A. vulgaris* and has become naturalized from Nova Scotia to Massachusetts.

Alchemilla Wichurae Buser has been collected only in East Greenland.

Alchemilla glomerulans Buser and *A. filicaulis* Buser range on this side of the Atlantic from Greenland to Labrador, and the latter has been collected also on Newfoundland.

APHANES

See remarks under *Alchemilla*. The true *Aphanes arvensis* L. has been collected in America in Nova Scotia, evidently there an introduced plant. The American plants, included in it or confused with it, have much smaller flowers, the hypanthium being only 1 mm. instead of nearly 2 mm. long. They were distinguished in the North American Flora as four species, differing in minor characters.

Aphanes australis Rydb. includes all specimens collected in the southeastern United States. It differs from those on the Pacific coast in the short ovate sepals, connivent in fruit. In the western species the sepals are lanceolate to ovate-lanceolate and ascending in fruit.

Aphanes macrosepala Rydb. differs in the elongated sepals, nearly as long as the densely pilose hypanthium.

Aphanes occidentalis (Nutt.) Rydb. and *A. cuneifolia* (Nutt.) Rydb. have short sepals and puberulent or glabrous hypanthium. They differ from each other in the form of the leaves.

LACHEMILLA

See remarks under *Alchemilla*.

Lachemilla orbiculata (R. & P.) Rydb. and *L. venusta* (Cham. & Schlecht.) Rydb. belong to a group in habit and leaf-form approaching the genus *Alchemilla*, but the plants are sarmentose. Both *Alchemilla orbiculata* R. & P. and *A. pectinata* HBK. have been recorded for Mexico and Central America. It is evident that the specimens labeled as either of the two constitute but one species. A closer examination of literature and specimens has revealed

that the two supposed species are identical, and that *Lachemilla orbiculata* ranges from Central Mexico to Bolivia.

The rest of the North American species except *L. ocreata* resemble *Aphanes* more strongly in habit and leaves, but they are all perennials.

Lachemilla procumbens (Rose) Rydb. is perhaps the most common of the Mexican species. Specimens of it are usually labeled *Alchemilla sibbaldiaefolia* HBK. Humboldt, Bonpland & Kunth's figure* shows that the original *A. sibbaldiaefolia* has different hypanthium, inflorescence and leaves, the latter in fact less like those of *Sibbaldia procumbens* than those of *L. procumbens* are.

Lachemilla domingensis (Urb.) Rydb. was based wholly on the description of *Alchemilla domingensis* Urb., no specimens of any *Lachemilla* having been seen from the West Indies at that time. Long after the publication of that part of the North American Flora containing *Lachemilla*, the first specimens were seen, but both the place in the key and the description were found to be correct and nothing needs to be added.

The following species were proposed as new: *Lachemilla Schiedeana* Rydb., *L. Pringlei* Rydb., *L. orizabensis* Rydb., and *L. Bourgeaui* Rydb. The first two were based in part on *Alchemilla hirsuta campestris* Cham. & Schlecht., which was described from a mixture.

Lachemilla ocreata (Donn. Smith) Rydb. is a very peculiar plant, apparently leafless, the leaves being reduced to connate imbricate sheaths, cleft into linear divisions. It is closely related to the South American *Alchemilla nivalis*.

ZYGALCHEMILLA

This genus was based on *Alchemilla pinnata* R. & P., which has pinnate instead of palmately lobed leaves, as all the other species of the tribe have. This character, as well as the 3-nerved sepals and bractlets, constitutes the basis for the generic segregation. A rather interesting fact in its history may be recorded. Remy† described a supposed new species as *Alchemilla pinnata*, but finding that the name was preoccupied by *A. pinnata* R. & P.,

* Nov. Gen. & Sp. 6: pl. 561.

† Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. III. 6: 354. 1846.

he changed it to *A. achilleaefolia* Remy.* Remy's species was based on Dombey's plant from Peru, he overlooking the fact that this plant belonged to the original *A. pinnata* R. & P. He, therefore, originally described the same plant under the same name, and consequently the second synonym was superfluous.

SANGUISORBA

In the North American Flora, the genus *Sanguisorba* was taken in its original narrower sense, *i. e.*, the perennial species with only 2-4 stamens, and 1 pistil with muricate papillose stigmas. Of this genus, four native North American and one introduced species, *S. officinalis* L., were recognized.

Sanguisorba canadensis L. is limited to the northeastern part of this continent. The plants referred to it from the northwest belong to the following two species.

Sanguisorba sitchensis C. A. Meyer [*S. latifolia* (Hook.) Coville] has white flowers. Piper in his Flora of Washington,† makes the following remark: "The red-flowered form of this species is referred by Howell to *S. officinalis* L. The white-flowered ordinary form was referred to *S. media* L. in Hooker's Flora." This statement is not correct. Hooker's *S. media* is described as having red flowers and is the same as *S. Menziesii* Rydb., described in the North American Flora. Howell's *S. officinalis* has, as stated, red flowers, but the filaments are but slightly exerted and filiform, not twice as long as the sepals nor dilated. It is the same as *S. microcephala* Presl.

POTERIDIUM

I believe that the genus *Poteridium* Spach should be reestablished for the annual species of *Sanguisorba* with brush-like stigmas. The first species of this genus was originally described as *Poterium annuum* Nutt. in Hooker's Flora Boreali-Americana. Hooker adopted Nuttall's manuscript name, which the author had applied to the species growing in Arkansas and neighboring states, but the specimens treated in that flora belong to the Pacific coast species. Hooker's *Poterium annuum* is, therefore, a composite. The

* *L. c.* III. 8: 224. 1847.

† Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 11: 336. 1906.

question then arises, which of the two species should be called *Poteridium annuum*. As Nuttall himself afterwards in Torrey & Gray's Flora separated the two, and applied *Poterium annuum* to the eastern plant and *P. occidentalis* to the western one, it is best to apply the names in that way.

POTERIUM

This genus resembles *Sanguisorba* in habit, but the stamens in the staminate flowers are numerous and declined; the pistils are usually 2, and the stigmas brush-like. Linnaeus originally had two species in this genus, of which the first, *P. Sanguisorba*, for several reasons must be regarded as the type. To use *Poterium* for the second species, *P. spinosum* L., as Focke has done,* is not correct. For that genus the name *Sarcopoterium* Spach should be used.

ACAENA

This genus has been taken in its narrower sense, excluding the genus *Ancistrum*.

Acaena agrimonioides HBK. I have seen no specimens agreeing with the original description of this species. All specimens seen and so named belong to *A. elongata*. Bitter, in Bibliotheca Botanica,† cited it as a synonym and on page 324 he stated that it is "to be regarded as synonymous with *A. elongata*," but nowhere does he give any reason for so doing. In the original diagnosis of *A. agrimonioides*, the leaflets are described as being 8–10 lines (*i. e.*, 16–20 mm.) long, and the lower gradually smaller. In all specimens of *A. elongata* I have seen from Mexico the leaflets are rarely 15 mm. long and the lower pairs scarcely smaller than the upper. Although *A. agrimonioides* is unknown to me and my description in the North American Flora was drawn from the original Latin diagnosis, I can but regard it as distinct from *A. elongata*.

Acaena elongata L. Hemsley in his Biologia Centrali-Americana‡ admitted four species of *Acaena* to Mexico, viz. *A. agrimonioides* HBK., *A. elongata* L., *A. lappacea* R. & P. and *A.*

* Engl. & Prantl, Nat. Pflanzenfam. 3³: 45.

† 74: 28.

‡ 1: 378.

laevigata Vahl. Under *A. agrimonioides* HBK., he cited only Humboldt & Bonpland's specimens and hence held the same opinion of this species as I do.

In the North American Flora I have given my reasons for excluding *A. lappacea* and *A. laevigata* from the Mexican flora. There is no question regarding *A. laevigata* not being found there, neither is there in regard to *A. lappacea*, unless Bitter is correct in regarding it as a synonym of *A. elongata*. Against this speaks the fact that the typical *A. elongata* has not been found in Peru. In giving the distribution of *A. elongata*, Bitter gave "perhaps also in Peru," which shows that he had seen no specimens from that country. The typical *A. elongata* he described under the name *A. elongata gracilis* n. var. (an altogether unnecessary name), and this is limited by him to Mexico. It extends, however, through Central America to Colombia, but is not found as far south as Ecuador. Here it is represented by *A. elongata robusta* Bitter. If any form extends into Peru, it is this, which may be *A. lappacea*. My sincere opinion, however, is that *A. lappacea* was redescribed by Bitter under the name *A. torilicarpa* n. sp.

Acaena californica Bitter. The Californian species of *Acaena* has had a rather varied history. It was first treated by Hooker and Arnott in the Botany of Beechey's Voyage under the name *A. pinnatifida*, the authors supposing that it was the same as *A. pinnatifida* R. & P. of Peru. Torrey saw that it was not, but rather closer to *A. trifida* R. & P. and even listed it as such,* although it was not described under that name until twenty years later, in the Botany of California. For some years I have known that even this identification was erroneous, but have regarded it as the lost *Acaena tridactyla* Presl.† That author gives as the type locality "Mexico occidentale." As California at the time Haenke visited it was a part of Mexico, this interpretation does not seem out of place, and I still think it possible that it is not far from the truth. Bitter,‡ however, claimed that he had seen the type at Prague and identified it as the South American *A. trifida* R. & P. It is possible that Haenke, who also

* Pac. R. Rep. 4: 84. 1856.

† Epim. Bot. 201. 1849.

‡ Bibl. Bot. 74: 294.

collected in Chili and Peru, might have mislabeled the specimens. On the strength of this claim of Bitter's, I have reluctantly adopted his name *A. californica*. Bitter distinguishes not less than five varieties of this species. Anyone who knows the variability of the plant can see only individual variation in these varieties.

AGRIMONIA

Mr. Bicknell* in his paper on *Agrimonia* states: "Perhaps no one of our long-known plants has more effectually escaped a right understanding by botanists than the familiar Agrimony of the Eastern States, current in local floras and text-books as *Agrimonia Eupatoria* L." In fact, the genus as a whole was poorly understood here in America, before Mr. Bicknell took up the work on the same, and from the publication of his paper dates really our true conception of the species. It is strange, however, that this should have been the case, when Dr. Wallroth had presented a very good paper on the genus in 1842. It is true that most monographic work done in Europe on North American plants is rather poor and unreliable, and therefore we are liable to ignore such work done abroad. This might have been the reason why Wallroth's species have not been adopted. The writer took up most of Wallroth's names in the North American Flora. That Mr. Bicknell did not do so was unfortunate, as he will now not get the full credit for what his paper really was worth to us. The main reasons for his not taking up Wallroth's names were the following: (1) at that time the unfortunate Madison amendments to the Rochester Code were in force making older varietal names supplant specific names; (2) at that time the names proposed in Muhlenberg's Catalogue were generally regarded as properly published. In fact, most of them should be regarded as *nomina nuda*, for the adjectives added to these names evidently were not intended as descriptions, but as a part of the trivial or common name. If these two causes had not influenced Mr. Bicknell, I should not have had occasion to change his nomenclature except in one case, viz. *Agrimonia striata* Michx., which he had misunderstood. Even in this case, he was really not to blame. See below under that species.

* Bull. Torrey Club 23: 508. 1896.

Agrimonia gryposepala Wallr. This has gone under the name of *A. Eupatoria* L. ever since Pursh's time or perhaps even since Walter's time. In general habit and in the size of the fruit it approaches more the European *A. Eupatoria* than any other of our North American species; but the structure of the fruit and the flowers are different. See the key. It was first distinguished by Muhlenberg, who gave it the name *A. Eupatoria hirsuta* in his Catalogue in 1813, but, as stated before, without proper description. It was subsequently published under Muhlenberg's name by Torrey in his Flora, in 1824. The first specific name, however, is that of Wallroth in 1842. His is also the first really good and extensive description. He was the first one to point out the peculiar sepals and characteristic arrangement of the bristles of the fruit, which distinguish it from any other of the species of the United States. It is therefore very appropriate that his specific name is now restored. The specimens from California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Mexico are usually somewhat different, but no constant characters have been found on which to base a separation.

Agrimonia macrocarpa (Focke) Rydb. This is the only North American species which approaches *A. gryposepala* in the structure of the sepals and of the fruit. It differs, however, in the elongated hypanthium and the more copious pubescence. Focke made it a variety of *A. parviflora*, to which it has little relationship. The only characters in which it approaches that species are the form (not the number) of the leaflets and the coarse pubescence. The structure of the fruit and the flower and the number of the leaflets are not at all the same. Its range is limited to Guatemala, from where the following specimens have been seen:

GUATEMALA: Coban, 1907, *von Tuerckheim* 1377; Dept. Huchuetenango, 1896, *Seler* 2594.

Agrimonia rostellata Wallr. Muhlenberg was also the first one to distinguish this species and gave it in his Catalogue the name *A. Eupatoria glabra*, but without a proper description. De Candolle mistook it for *A. parviflora* Ait., probably because it has the smallest flowers of all our North American species. It has also the smallest fruit, which is different from the rest in that it is more rounded at the base and less grooved. Mr. Bicknell

adopted for this species the name *A. striata* Michx. See under that species, where the case is discussed in full.

Agrimonia microcarpa Wallroth. The first name for this species was *A. pumila* Muhl., printed in his Catalogue. The only thing said about this species beside the name is: "Small, Miss.," which means that the trivial name is small agrimony and that it grows in Mississippi. Now the only small agrimony growing in Mississippi is the present species and Mr. Bicknell evidently identified *Agrimonia pumila* Muhl. correctly. It had never been published under that name however, before Bicknell adopted it in his paper. There is no question that the species that Bicknell had in mind and that I now discuss is *A. pumila* Muhl. There is even more doubt that *A. microcarpa* Wallr. belongs to this plant. Wallroth cites three specimens: Pennsylvania (*Moser*), southern Georgia (*Beyrich*), and Jalapa (*Schiede*). As there is no indication of type, the first specimen should be regarded as such. I have seen no specimen of it from Pennsylvania, the nearest being from Maryland. In the former state it is represented by *A. platycarpa* Wallr. It is not likely that Wallroth should have confused the two species, as he is the author of both. Beyrich's plant undoubtedly belongs to *A. microcarpa* as here understood, but Schiede's plant from Jalapa, Mexico, belongs to *A. Pringlei*. The latter is glandular-granuliferous and must, therefore, be placed near *A. striata*. No one before Bicknell seems to have noticed the tuberous character of *A. microcarpa* and the other non-glandular species. This is not found in *A. Pringlei*.

Agrimonia platycarpa Wallr. This has not been recognized since Wallroth's time. It is closely related to *A. microcarpa*. In the latter the leaves are situated near the base of the stem, having either 3 leaflets of nearly the same size, or else also an additional much smaller pair below. In *A. platycarpa* the leaflets are 5 or 7 and the lower only slightly reduced. The fruit in *A. platycarpa* is broader than in *A. microcarpa*, usually broader than long, and with a more prominent flange or rim. Its range is more northern than that of *A. microcarpa*.

Agrimonia pubescens Wallr. This was first distinguished by Torrey & Gray under the name *Agrimonia Eupatoria mollis*. It was raised to specific rank by Britton,* following the Madison

* Bull. Torrey Club 19: 221. 1894.

amendment and well knowing the publication of *A. pubescens* Wallr., which he gives as a synonym.

Agrimonia Bicknellii (Kearney) Rydb. This was well described by Mr. Bicknell* as a variety of *A. mollis*, but without a varietal name. This was supplied a year later by Mr. Kearney. It is true that the characters separating *A. pubescens* (= *A. mollis*) and this species are not absolute and that intermediate forms are not lacking. *A. pubescens* is at home in the central states west of the Alleghenies, but extends east thereof into Virginia and Georgia. The home of *A. Bicknellii* is the Atlantic coast, but it is found as far west as Pennsylvania and Tennessee. In the Mississippi valley only *A. pubescens* is found and on the Atlantic border only typical *A. Bicknellii*. The intermediate forms are found in the Alleghenian region, where the ranges of the two overlap. These two species are the nearest American representatives of the European *A. Eupatoria*, but have much smaller fruit. Especially is *A. Bicknellii* sometimes hard to distinguish from *A. Eupatoria* without the fruit. Two western specimens in the United States National Herbarium I have determined doubtfully as *A. Bicknellii*, viz. one collected at Fort Snelling, Minnesota, by Mearns, and the other at Naperville, Illinois, by Umbach. They may belong to *A. Eupatoria* L.

Agrimonia Eupatoria L. Britton and Bicknell believed that this species was not found at all in America. No specimen has been seen from the East, where the species is most likely to be found introduced. There are, however, two specimens, one in the National Herbarium and one in the herbarium of the Missouri Botanical Garden, which without any doubt belong to the species. Holzinger's specimen, especially, has the fruit so well developed that there is no question of the identity. The specimens are:

MINNESOTA: Winona, 1889, *Holzinger*.

WISCONSIN: Mirror Lake, 1903, *Eggert*.

Agrimonia striata Michx. This species has been badly misunderstood. Probably the real cause of this is that in Michaux's herbarium there are two specimens on the sheet of *A. striata*. The left-hand specimen represents the plant, here treated under that name, and the right-hand specimen is one of *A. rostellata*.

* Bull. Torrey Club 23: 517. 1896.

One of the authors of Torrey & Gray's Flora, probably Dr. Gray, had seen this sheet, for they cite *A. striata* Michx. and appendage an exclamation point (!) after the same. They gave this as a synonym of their *A. Eupatoria parviflora*, which was based on *A. parviflora* DC., the same as *A. rostellata* Wallr. They also cite under this a specimen collected by Dr. Pitcher. This specimen is in the Torrey herbarium and belongs also to *A. rostellata*. This shows that Torrey and Gray regarded *A. striata* Michx. the same as what we now call *A. rostellata*. It was, therefore, not strange that Mr. Bicknell followed them, especially as one of the specimens in Michaux's herbarium belonged to that species. He, therefore, proposed a new name, *A. Brittoniana*, for the plant represented by the left-hand specimen in Michaux's herbarium and here treated under the name *A. striata*. By the courtesy of the Gray Herbarium we have received a print of a photograph of the type of *A. striata*, and this shows that the left-hand specimen is to be regarded as the type, not only bearing the name *Agrimonia striata* Michx., but also the word Canada on the labels. This is also the only species of the two which agrees with the description: "*fructibus . . . sulcato-striatis*."

Agrimonia Pringlei Rydb. One specimen of this, as said before, was included in *A. microcarpa* by Wallroth. It is true that it resembles that species, *A. platycarpa*, and *A. rostellata* in habit and leaf-form, but not in pubescence nor in the roots. The leaves are glandular-granuliferous and more or less pubescent as they are in *A. striata*, and the roots are not tuberous-thickened. It is represented by the following specimens:

MEXICO, STATE OF VERA CRUZ: near Jalapa, 1903, C. G. Pringle 11876; Huatusco, 1841, Liebmann 1637; State of Vera Cruz, Pringle 11830.

Agrimonia parviflora Ait. This species has been the best understood of the North American species except *A. incisa*. It is true that in the beginning two additional names were given to it, *A. suaveolens* by Pursh, and *A. serrifolia* by Wallroth. The latter was probably led astray by De Candolle who had used the name *A. parviflora* for another species, viz. *A. rostellata*. Lately, Professor Urban* has proposed a new species, *A. polyphylla*. To me

* Symb. Ant. 7: 227. 1912.

this seems only a slender form of *A. parviflora*, grown under somewhat abnormal conditions. The specimens on which this new species were based extend the range of *A. parviflora* to Santo Domingo.

Agrimonia incisa T. & G. No new facts were added in regard to this species in the North American Flora.

ADENOSTOMA

This genus has often been included in the Dryadeae, Sanguisorbeae, or Cercocarpeae. It could not very well be included in either the Dryadeae or the Cercocarpeae, as the ovules and seeds are inserted in the distal end of the ovary. It was placed in Cercocarpeae on account of its solitary achenes, but there are several other genera with solitary achenes that could not be placed in that tribe. In the characters of the fruit and hypanthium, it agrees best with the Sanguisorbeae, but the ovary is covered with a cushion, under the margin of which the style is inserted on one side and doubly bent; the species are shrubs of a peculiar habit with small entire linear leaves. It is, therefore, best to regard the genus as representing a distinct tribe.

Adenostoma fasciculatum H. & A. This species is very variable, and it is hard to decide if the next species should be merged in it or not. The leaves are either short or long, but usually distinctly petioled. The branches are glabrous or minutely puberulent, and in such cases approach the next species. *Adenostoma fasciculatum densifolium* Eastw. is in my opinion only a mere form of this species with more crowded leaves and inflorescence.

Adenostoma brevifolium Nutt. It was with some reluctance that I took up Nuttall's view regarding this plant. Usually, however, Nuttall had good reasons for his segregates, even if Torrey and Gray reduced many of them. Whatever value this plant may have as a species, the form is usually well marked by its short obtuse, subsessile leaves, and pubescent branches. S. Watson regarded it a variety of *A. fasciculatum*, and described it as var. *obtusifolium*. C. K. Schneider reduces the latter to a mere form, but describes a new variety under the name var. *hirsuta*. Whatever Schneider might have had in mind when he made the reduction, the fact is that his var. *hirsuta* is the same as the original *A. brevifolia* of Nuttall.

Adenostoma sparsifolium Torrey. This was originally described under the form "*A. sparsifolia*." The name *Adenostoma* is, however, neuter. The species may perhaps represent a distinct genus as the throat of the hypanthium lacks the fleshy glands, characteristic of the type species.

COLEOGYNE

This genus was included in Cercocarpeae by Focke in Engler and Prantl's Pflanzenfamilien, but evidently erroneously so. The tribe Cercocarpeae in that work was a very unnatural one, composed of five genera. *Purshia* and *Chamaebatia* evidently belong to Dryadeae, notwithstanding their solitary carpels. *Adenostoma* and *Coleogyne* represent distinct tribes, which leaves *Cercocarpus* alone in the tribe. In *Coleogyne* the ovule and seeds are inserted at the distal end of the ovary and pendent, in Dryadeae and Cercocarpeae at the proximal end and erect or ascending. Furthermore, the pistil and the stamens in *Coleogyne* are separated by a tube equalling the stamens. The filaments are adnate to the base on the outside of this tube. Whether this tube represents a prolonged hypanthium or a set of abortive and united filaments, is hard to tell. The fact is that no such structure is found anywhere else in Rosaceae, but something similar is found in Capparidaceae. The fruit itself, however, is an achene, and hence very unlike the capparidaceous fruits. Another character abnormal to the Rosaceae is the opposite leaves and branches. The only other rosaceous genus, that I can remember, having opposite leaves is *Rhodotypos*.* The latter is so closely related to *Kerria* and in other respects typical, that no doubt can be entertained regarding its belonging to the family. It is not so with *Coleogyne*. Its peculiar flowers, its peculiar habit, more resembling Rhamnaceae, and opposite leaves and branches, etc., give rise to the question, may it not properly represent a new family?

WALDSTEINIA

Waldsteinia Doniana Tratt. Fifteen years ago Dr. Small distinguished from *W. fragarioides* a new species which he published

* Since the above was written Captain John Donnell Smith has described (Bot. Gaz. 57: 420. 1914) another abnormal genus with opposite leaves, viz. *Guamatela*.

under the name *W. parviflora*, the main difference being the smaller flowers. In looking up the illustrations of *W. fragarioides*, I found two plates that evidently illustrate *W. parviflora* instead of *W. fragarioides*. These were *plate 1567* in the Botanical Magazine and *plate 408* in the Botanical Cabinet. I also found that Trattinick had based his *Waldsteinia Doniana* on the former of these plates, which name therefore should supersede the later *W. parviflora* Small.

Waldsteinia lobata (Baldw.) T. & G. This species must be very local, for in the herbaria I have seen specimens from scarcely half a dozen localities, all in the mountains of Georgia and North Carolina. The achenes in this species are but 1 or 2.

Waldsteinia idahoensis Piper. This, like its eastern relative, is very local; in fact, it has been collected only at the type station, but may have a wider distribution, that region having been rather little botanized. The achenes are usually 2.

NEW YORK BOTANICAL GARDEN